

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Summary of Examiner Interview

The Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy extended in granting the personal interview conducted on November 29, 2006. During the interview, the Applicant, Applicant's Representative and the Examiner discussed the present invention and the differences between the present invention and the cited art.

Summary of the Response

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 17-19, 21-24, 30, 32, 35-37, 39, 40, 45-49, 51, 54, 57-59 and 64 have been amended and new claims 68-79 have been added. Thus, claims 1-79 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action mailed May 22, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 30-31, and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0197991 to Anvekar et al. ("Anvekar"). The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 16, 18-24, 29, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of WO 03/019969 to Anius ("Anius") and claims 10-15 and 25-28 as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Anius and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0129991 to Allison et al. ("Allison"). It is noted that claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 17-19, 21-24, 30, 32, 35-37, 39, 40, 45-49, 51, 54, 57-59 and 64 have been amended and new claims 68-79 have been added. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejection as follows.

Claims 1-79 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

Further to the discussions during the interview of November 29, 2006, the Applicant submits that Anvekar does not disclose or suggest a communication system including at least the combination of a mobile device including a SIM and an IMSI, wherein a signal gateway routes communication between the mobile device and a first public mobile network using a first MSISDN, wherein the signal gateway couples calls between the SIM and a second public mobile network using a second MSISDN, and wherein the signal gateway routes the communication using a single IMSI, as recited in amended claim 1.

Among other things, the invention recited in amended claim 1 enables providing a local number profile to a roaming mobile subscriber with the use of only one IMSI. This allows the use of an HPMN IMSI without involving a partner VPMN IMSI. Thus, no matter where a SIM is roaming, only the HPMN IMSI is registered, and only one registration step is required. There is only one HLR profile at the HPMN, and only one authentication key is required for the SIM, the HPMN one. Thus, the invention recited in amended claim 1, as amended, operates without the need for a special SIM.

In contrast, Anvekar teaches a multi-IMSI system that assigns a partner VPMN IMSI to a subscriber each time a SIM is registered with a partner VPMN. Thus, in Anvekar, the mobile device must include multiple IMSIs, one for each mobile network operator.

In addition, Anvekar requires a two step registration process rather than the one step registration enabled by the claimed invention. In Anvekar, the additional IMSI is sent to the SIM for an additional registration step with the local IMSI. This two step

registration delays the roamer's registration with a network. In Anvekar, a local country number to an inbound roamer is assigned by the RSPN at the VPMN. While in the claimed invention, the local number can be assigned by the HPMN.

Furthermore, by using an additional IMSI in Anvekar, the subscriber's local IMSI of a partner VPMN has a local profile at the VPMN HLR, which wastes additional partner VPMN resources on top of the local partner VPMN IMSI. The claimed invention overcomes such requirements and only requires that the subscriber profile be stored in the local network.

In Anvekar, a local authentication key will need to be loaded into the SIM for each local IMSI, introducing potential security flaws, for example SIMs, for Anvekar's technology generally do not allow key changes. Anvekar requires a special SIM and client for the mobile device of a subscriber, adding further cost and logistics to use of the system. The claimed invention provides a purely network solution that does not require additional client features such as a special SIM or mobile device.

Among some things, the system of amended claim 1 avoids numerous logistical problems in the system of Anvekar by routing communication using either the first MSISDN or the second MSISDN through the use of a single IMSI. The Applicants submit that Anvekar does not disclose or suggest a communication system including at least a mobile device including a SIM and a single IMSI, and a gateway routing communication between the mobile device and a first public mobile network using a first MSISDN and routing communication between the mobile device and a second public mobile network using a second MSISDN, wherein the signal gateway routes the communication **using the single IMSI**.

The Applicant submits that Anius and Allison fail to cure the deficiency in Anvekar. The Applicant further notes that Anius deals only with call signaling and does not deal with SMS to a local number, as claimed in amended claim 1. The invention of claim 1, as amended, allows a subscriber to be reached by SMS and call on any of their MSISDNs, whether a local partners' MSISDN or a HPMN MSISDN.

For at least this combination of reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 18-19, 30, and 39, as amended, are likewise allowable. As claims 1, 19, and 30 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 2-16, 20-29, and 31-38, which depend from allowable claims 1, 19, and 30, are allowable for at least the above noted reasons and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Claim 64, which was added in the Response dated November 22, 2006, is directed to a method for supporting Mobile Subscriber Integrated Service Digital Network (MSISDN) number in an inbound mobile roaming device, the method comprising registering the mobile device in a foreign public mobile network, wherein signaling related to the registering is directed through a signaling gateway coupling a home network of the mobile device and the foreign public mobile network without using a Roaming Service Provider Node (RSPN) at the foreign public mobile network; and transmitting a welcome message to the mobile device, wherein the message comprises an offer to receive incoming calls from within the foreign public mobile network at preferred rates while registering with the foreign public mobile network.

The method of claim 64 enables one signal gateway to be employed regardless of the number of partner FPMNs involved. This reduces the logistics of participant

FPMNs. Furthermore, the signal gateway can control voice routing, as well as SMS delivery on any of the network MSISDN of a subscriber, which helps routing as well as billing.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Anvekar does not disclose or suggest a signal gateway. Instead, Anvekar discloses a distributed architecture of RSPN nodes, wherein each partner employs a RSPN node all of which are connected by a global data network. This requires significant overhead and logistics for each partner network.

The Office Action relies on Anius as teaching a signal gateway. However, Anius also involves a RSPN node at each partner FPMN, in contrast to the claimed invention, which does not require a RSPN node at each partner FPMN, as recited in amended claim 64.

For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 64 is allowable over the cited art.

For reasons similar to those discussed above for claims 1 and 64, the Applicant submits that claims 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61, 64, 68-70 and 77 are likewise allowable over the cited art. In addition, the Applicant submits that claims 2-16, 20-29, 31-38, 41-48, 50-60, 62, 63 and 65-67, each of which depends from one of allowable claims 1, 17-19, 30, 39, 40, 49, 61, 64 are likewise allowable over the cited art, for at least these reasons. Further, regarding newly added claims 68-79, the Applicant submits that these claims are allowable.

With regard to each of the rejections under §103 in the Office Action, it is also respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not yet set forth a *prima facie* case of

obviousness. The PTO has the burden under §103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2nd 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Both the case law of the Federal Circuit and the PTO itself have made clear that where a modification must be made to the prior art to reject or invalidate a claim under §103, there must be a showing of proper motivation to do so. The mere fact that a prior art reference could arguably be modified to meet the claim is insufficient to establish obviousness. The PTO can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references. Id. In order to establish obviousness, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so. See also In re Gordon, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (prior art could not be turned upside down without motivation to do so); In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Lee, 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

The Office Action merely states that the invention is obvious in light of the cited references, which is an insufficient showing of motivation. See Office Action at pages 6-11.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 028327-00068.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Juliana Haydoutova', written over the printed name.

Juliana Haydoutova
Registration No. 43,313

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8469
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810